

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION**

DARRELL M. JENKINS,

Plaintiff,

v.

AYODEJI ODUNLAMI, et al.,

Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 6:23-cv-157-JDK-JDL

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Darrell Jenkins, an inmate at TDCJ Darrington Unit, proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis*, filed this lawsuit against Defendant pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Docket No. 1. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge John D. Love for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for disposition of the action.

On January 29, 2025, Judge Love issued a Report recommending that Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 33) be granted and Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed. Docket No. 41. The Report was sent to Plaintiff and Plaintiff acknowledged receipt. Docket No. 42. Plaintiff has not filed objections and the time to do so has passed.


This Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of service of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court

examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

Here, Plaintiff did not file any objections. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews the legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 41) as the findings of this Court. Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Docket No. 33) is **GRANTED**. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's claims against Defendants in their official capacities are **DISMISSED** without prejudice, and Plaintiff's claims against Defendants in their individual capacities are **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **27th** day of **February, 2025**.

  
JEREMY D. KERNODLE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE